

#### REMARKS

The examiner has rejected claims 9-14 under 35 USC 102 over Franchi. Applicant believes that the examiner might have intended to refer to claims 8-14. The claims have been amended and it is believed that the claims now of record are not open to rejection over the prior art. Specifically, claim 8, as amended, specifies a monitoring system configured to recognize an imprint value of playing cards placed face up on the table. Reference to this is made in the specification for instance in the penultimate paragraph on page 7.

The provision of two value recognition systems, one for cards face up on the table and one for cards face down when drawn from the card shoe, significantly alters the game. For instance, it means that players need not actually be able to see the table, as details concerning the face up cards are also provided.

The two recognition systems also provide for a check, in case the card reading equipment makes a mistake in recognizing a card. Errors in recognition systems do occur as is well known by specialists working in this field. The most reliable card recognition systems presently available in the market have a reliability of 99.99%. This will mean that on average one in every 10,000 cards will be recognized incorrectly, not recognized or missed. In an intense game 10,000 cards can be dealt at a table within about five to six hours, meaning that a system with only one recognition system will crash every five to six hours under busy conditions.

In the present system, signals from both of these recognition systems are input into the electronic data processing system. This arrangement therefore allows the game to be securely and reliably monitored in contrast to prior arrangements.

Regarding providing electronic credit, it is acknowledged that this in itself is not new. However, the present system

allows a credit control unit to be provided for players and/or the dealer. This point is reflected in independent claim 8.

Claims 11 and 13 have also been amended to clarify that the information about the game run is obtained from both recognition systems. These features of the amended claims have a clear basis in the specification as filed, and quite clearly differentiate the claimed subject matter from the disclosure of Franchi, and define a system with significant advantages relative thereto, whilst more clearly defining the claimed subject matter.

A method claim (claim 17) has also been added to stress how the invention with the two card recognition systems allows the game to be played by a plurality of players, even when the players may not be able to see all of the cards placed on the table (as mentioned in claim 19).

Respectfully submitted,



---

John Smith-Hill  
Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.  
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220  
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100  
Fax (503) 574-3197  
Docket: SWIN 3496